

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-26, and 28-32 are currently pending. Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, and 32 are amended herein. Applicant acknowledges receipt of the above-identified Office Action, and respectfully traverses the Office Action in its entirety.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-26, and 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050102382 to MacGregor et al (“MacGregor”). Applicant respectfully traverses. However, in an effort to expedite examination of the instant application, Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly describe the claimed invention. More specifically, the claims have been amended to clarify and reinforce the concept previously set forth in the preamble of independent claims 1 and 17 that the current claims are directed to a system and method for consolidation of computing resources, including the moving of services provided by one computing resource to another computing resource.

As described in the specification and recited in the claims, the instant claims are directed to a method and system for consolidating at least two computing devices, wherein information indicative of the characteristics of the services provided by computing devices (or a subset of the computing devices) is stored in at least two datasets. The characteristics stored in the at least two datasets comprises at least one of: system parameters, executable process parameters, and computing device database definition parameters. The characteristics of the at least two computing devices are loaded into a relational database for comparison to each other, thereby facilitating consolidation of the services performed on at least one of the computing devices such that the services are provided by another computing device instead. The net effect of which is to relocate the service and ultimately reduce the number of computing resources needed.

By contrast, MacGregor is directed to systems and methods which “utilizes an instant messaging system for providing a network management capability to acquire, cache, transfer, store, analyze, correlate and display network management information from diverse network components.” (paragraph [0008]). While MacGregor does recite the term “consolidation” in paragraph [0008], it is respectfully submitted that the term, as used therein, is intended to be synonymous with “aggregation” or “grouping”, rather than true consolidation (i.e., reduction in

quantity) as recited in Applicant's claims and in Applicant's specification. This is evident, for example, in paragraph [0033], wherein MacGregor describes that "A group chat event manager (GEM) uses the existing notion of group chat between users to consolidate events into logical groups". Applicant's position is further bolstered by the fact that the term "consolidation" is recited in the abstract, paragraph [0008], and paragraph [0033], with only paragraph [0033] providing any description of what that term is supposed to mean. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that MacGregor does not teach or suggest the consolidation of computing resources as recited in Applicant's claims, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

It is further suggested that since MacGregor is directed to providing network management capabilities (Abstract, paragraph [0008], etc.), MacGregor is so far removed from the field of Applicant's invention (computing resource consolidation) as to be irrelevant to the claimed invention. Put another way, one properly skilled in the art would not be motivated to look to MacGregor in attempting to consolidate computing systems, in part because MacGregor does not teach or suggest consolidation of computing resources, storing computing device characteristics (i.e., information describing the computing device) in data files, loading computing device characteristics into a relational database, or evaluating computing device characteristics in a relational database for consolidation purposes.

CONCLUSION

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, it is submitted that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Additional characteristics or arguments may exist that distinguish the claims over the prior art, and Applicant respectfully reserves the right to present these arguments in the future, should they be necessary. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is courteously requested to contact applicant's undersigned representative.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-3790. If an extension of time is required, this should be considered a petition therefor. If the fees associated with a Request for Continued Examination are filed herewith, this should be considered a petition therefor.

Respectfully submitted,

/ James E. Goepel /

James E. Goepel (Reg. No. 50,851)
Attorney for Applicant

Unisys Corp.
Township Line and Union Meeting Roads
Unisys Way E8-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424
(215) 986-6188

Filed: August 7, 2009